

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application, and have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. No change in scope of these claims is either intended or believed to be effected by these changes. The abstract has amended as to matters of form. Claims 1 and 7 are independent.

At paragraph 1, the Office Action objected to the specification for containing an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. The Office Action required that the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code be deleted.

MPEP § 608.01 VII states that “[e]xamples of a hyperlink or a browser-executable code are a URL placed between these symbols ‘< >’ and http:// followed by a URL address.” Applicants have amended page 6, line 2, of the specification by deleting “http ://” from the Internet address. Therefore, the Internet address is no longer browser-executable. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

At paragraph 2, the Office Action states that the Information Disclosure Statement citing German Patent DE 35 18 301 A1, fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.98(a)(3) for not including a concise explanation of the relevance of that German patent.

MPEP § 609 states: “Where the information listed is not in the English language, but was cited in a search report or other action by a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application, the requirement for a concise explanation of relevance can be satisfied by submitting an English-language version of the search report or action which indicates the degree of relevance found by the foreign office. This may be an explanation of which portion of the reference is particularly relevant, to which claims it applies, or merely an ‘X’, ‘Y’, or ‘A’ indication on a search report.”

Applicants submit that the requirement of providing a concise explanation of relevance of German Patent DE 35 18 301 A1 was satisfied by the English-language version of the French Search Report submitted with the mentioned Information Disclosure Statement. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to return an initialed copy of the Form PTO-1449 submitted with that Information Disclosure Statement, indicating German Patent DE 35 18 301 A1 cited thereon has been considered.

Claims 1-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,638,498 to Tyler et al.

The present invention relates generally to progressive decoding of digital data coded with at least one region of interest. Recent methods for compressing images make it possible to code an image in a progressive way in terms of quality. The decoding of the image can also be progressive, and it is possible to display a part of the image, or a low-quality version thereof, before the entire image has been decoded. Moreover, it is possible to define a region of interest in the image, the region of interest being composed of one or more parts of the image. The region of interest is typically defined by a user and will typically be coded with a higher quality compared to the rest of the image.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for alerting during the progressive decoding of a digital image coded with a region of interest. The method includes detecting an end of decoding of the region of interest, and activating an indication of the end of decoding of the region of interest.

Tyler et al., as understood by Applicants, relates to reducing storage requirements for display data. Fig. 13, cited in the Office Action, is a flow diagram illustrating step 46 of Fig. 3, in which compressed data is decompressed based upon the assigned compression algorithms and the decompressed data is displayed. In step 310 of

Fig. 13, the process checks, when the pointer is at the end of the scan line, if any region(s) have been completely decompressed and displayed ("completed"). This can be checked, for example, by determining whether any end-of-region information has been retrieved from the decompression buffer. If one or more regions have been completed, then, in step 312, a number of new region descriptors equal to the amount of completed regions are retrieved from the compressed band buffer and stored in the decompression buffer. By continuing with the process, new region descriptors are eventually added in from each successive band of data on the page (e.g., each band's region descriptors can be linked to the next band's region descriptors to effectively provide an entire page's worth of descriptors).

If no regions have been completed in step 310, or after new compressed region descriptors have been loaded in step 312, then the process checks if the scan line pointer is at the end of the page. If not, the process returns to step 296, where the regions crossed by the next scan line (e.g., the scan line right under the previous scan line) are determined. If the scan line pointer is at the end of the page, the process is complete at step 314. The next page can then be decompressed and displayed, if desired, by returning to the start of the process at 290.

The Office Action asserts, at page 3, that block 310 of Tyler et al. discloses activation of an indication of the end of decoding of the region of interest. In particular, the Office Action asserts that "if the end of decoding the region of interest is detected, then an indication of 'YES' is activated." Applicants respectfully disagree with this reading of Tyler et al.

Fig. 13 of Tyler et al. is a flow diagram where the "YES" and "NO" are logical alternatives, but not indications, i.e. signs that would show (to a user) that the

decoding is at the end. In Tyler et al., the end of the decoding is tested at step 310 of Figure 13, which apparently gives rise to two alternatives:

- (1) if the decoding is completed, additional region descriptors are loaded (step 312);
- (2) otherwise, the pointer in charge of scanning the regions refers back to the beginning of the image.

Whatever the alternative, there is nothing in Tyler et al. to suggest that an indication of the end of the decoding is generated in any fashion. Fig. 13 of Tyler et al. is a flow diagram and is described as such in Tyler et al. (e.g., see column 30, lines 12-15), the flow diagram including a series of logical decision points. One such logical decision point is shown at step 310, in which the flow proceeds according to the outcome (YES or NO) of that decision point. The existence of that decision point is not signaled in any way to the user. As such, the Examiner's assertion, that step 310 somehow discloses that an indication of the end of decoding is generated, is not at all understood by Applicants.

Nothing in Tyler et al. would teach or suggest activating an indication of the end of decoding of a region of interest, as recited in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over Tyler et al.

Independent Claim 7 is a device claim corresponding to method Claim 1, and is believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.


A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from Claim 1 or 7 discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Leonard P. Diana".

Leonard P. Diana
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CLEAN VERSION OF AMENDED ABSTRACT

A method for alerting during the progressive decoding of a digital image coded with a region of interest, including the stages of detection of the end of the decoding of the region of interest, and activation of an indication of the end of decoding of the region of interest.